Limits to the scope of applicability of *extended formulations* for LP models of combinatorial optimization problems

Moustapha Diaby
OPIM Department; University of Connecticut; Storrs, CT 06268
moustapha.diaby@business.uconn.edu

Mark H. Karwan
Department of Industrial and Systems Engineering; SUNY at Buffalo; Amherst, NY 14260
mkarwan@buffalo.edu

arXiv:1403.0529v2 [cs.CC] 28 Jun 2014

Abstract: The purpose of this paper is to bring to attention and to make a contribution to the issue of defining/clarifying the scope of applicability of *extended formulations* (EF's) theory. Specifically, we show that EF theory is not valid for relating the sizes of descriptions of polytopes when the sets of the descriptive variables for those polytopes are disjoint, and that new definitions of the notion of "projection" upon which some of the recent *extended formulations* works (such as Kaibel (2011), Fiorini *et al.* (2011, 2012), Kaibel and Walter (2013), and Kaibel and Weltge (2013), for example) have been based can cause those works to over-reach in their conclusions.

Keywords: Extended Formulations; Linear Programming; Combinatorial Optimization; Computational Complexity.

1 Introduction

There has been a renewed interest and excellent work in *extended formulations* (EF's) over the past few years (see Conforti *et al.* (2010; 2013), and Vanderbeck and Wolsey (2010), for example). Since the seminal paper (Yannakakis (1991)), EF theory has been the single-most important paradigm for deciding the validity of proposed LP models for NP-Complete problems. However, the issue of its scope of applicability has been a largely overlooked issue, leading to the possibility of over-reaching claims (implied or explicitly-stated). The purpose of this paper is to make a contribution towards addressing the issue of delineating the scope of applicability of EF theory. Specifically, we will show that EF theory is not valid for relating the sizes of descriptions of polytopes when the sets of the descriptive variables for those polytopes are disjoint, and that new definitions of the notion of "projection" upon which some of the recent *extended formulations* works (such as Kaibel (2011), Fiorini et al. (2011, 2012), Kaibel and Walter (2013), and Kaibel and Weltge (2013), for example) have been based can cause those works to over-reach in their conclusions when the sets of the descriptive variables for the polytopes being related are disjoint or can be made so after redundant variables and constraints (with respect to the optimization problem at hand) are removed.

It should be noted that the intent of the paper is not to claim the correctness or incorrectness of any particular model that may have been developed in trying to address the "$P = NP$" question. Our aim is, strictly, to bring attention to limits to the scope within which EF theory is applicable when attempting to derive bounds on the sizes of linear programming models for combinatorial optimzation problems. In other words, the developments in the paper are not about deciding the correctness/incorrectness of any given LP model, but only about the issue of when such a decision (of correctness/incorrectness) is beyond the scope of EF theory.

One of the most fundamental assumptions in EF theory is that the addition of redundant variables and constraints to a given model of an optimization problem at hand does not change the EF relationships for that model. The key point of this paper is to show the flaw in this assumption, which is that it leads to ambiguity and degeneracy/loss of meaningfulness of the notion of EF when the sets of the descriptive variables for the polytopes involved are disjoint. We show that if redundant variables and constraints can be arbitrarily added to the description of a given polytope for the the purpose of establishing EF relationships, then every given mathematical programming model would be an EF of every other mathematical programming model, provided their sets of descriptive variables are disjoint, which would clearly mean a loss of meaningfulness of the notion (of EF).

Our developments in this paper were initially motivated by our realization that the "new" definition of EFs (Definition 3) which was first proposed in Kaibel (2011) and then subsequently used in Fiorini et al. (2011) becomes inconsistent with other and previous/"standard" definitions of EFs (see Definition 2) when the sets of the descriptive variables of the polytopes being related are disjoint. Comments we received in private communications and also in anonymous reviews on an earlier version of this paper were that our finding of inconsistency was "obvious," and that all of our developments were "obvious" because of that. Hence, we believe it may be useful to recall at this point that the Fiorini et al. (2011) work (which is based on the "new" definition in question) has been highly-recognized, having received numerous awards. Also, more generally, and perhaps more deeply, Martin's formulation of the Minimum Spanning Tree Problem (MSTP; see section 4.2 of this paper) is cited in almost every EF paper in the current literature as a "normal" EF of Edmonds' formulation of the MSTP (although with the acknowledgement that it "escapes" the results for EF of NP-Complete problems somehow). We argue that these facts highlight the need to bring our notions in this paper to the attention of the Optimization communities in general, and of the EF communities in particular.

The plan of the paper is as follows. First, we will review the background definitions in section 2. Our main result (i.e., the non-validity/non-applicability of EF theory when the sets of descriptive variables are disjoint) is developed in section 3. In section 4, we illustrate the discussions of section 3 using the Fiorini et al. (2011; 2012) developments, as well as Martin's (1991) LP formulation of the Minimum Spanning Tree Problem (MSTP). In section 5, we provide insights into the (correct) meaning/implication of the existence of a linear map between solutions of models, with respect to the task of solving an optimzation problem, when the set of descriptive variables in the models are disjoint. Finally, we offer some concluding remarks in section 6.

The general notation we will use is as follows.

Notation 1

1. $\mathbb{R}$: Set of real numbers;
2. $\mathbb{R}_{\not<}$: Set of non-negative real numbers;
3. $\mathbb{N}$: Set of natural numbers;
4. $\mathbb{N}_+$: Set of positive natural numbers;
5. "$\mathbf{0}$" : Column vector that has every entry equal to 0;
6. "$\mathbf{1}$" : Column vector that has every entry equal to 1;

7. $(\cdot)^T$: Transpose of $(\cdot)$;

8. $Conv(\cdot)$: Convex hull of $(\cdot)$.

2 Background definitions

For the purpose of making the paper as self-contained as possible, we review the basic definitions of *extended formulations* in this section.

Definition 2 ("Standard EF Definition" (Yannakakis (1991); Conforti *et al.* (2010; 2013))) An *extended formulation* for a polytope $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p$ is a polyhedron $U = \{(x, w) \in \mathbb{R}^{p+q} : Gx + Hw \leq g\}$ the projection, $\varphi_x(U) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^p : (\exists w \in \mathbb{R}^q : (x, w) \in U)\}$, of which onto x-space is equal to X (where $G \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times p}$, $H \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times q}$, and $g \in \mathbb{R}^m$).

Definition 3 ("Alternate EF Definition #1" (Kaibel (2011); Fiorini *et al.* (2011; 2012))) A polyhedron $U = \{(x, w) \in \mathbb{R}^{p+q} : Gx + Hw \leq g\}$ is an *extended formulation* of a polytope $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p$ if there exists a linear map $\pi : \mathbb{R}^{p+q} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$ such that X is the image of Q under π (i.e., $X = \pi(Q)$; where $G \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times p}$, $H \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times q}$, and $g \in \mathbb{R}^m$). (Kaibel (2011), Kaibel and Walter (2013), and Kaibel and Weltge (2013) refer to π as a "projection.")

Definition 4 ("Alternate EF Definition #2" (Fiorini *et al.* (2012))) An *extended formulation* of a polytope $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p$ is a linear system $U = \{(x, w) \in \mathbb{R}^{p+q} : Gx + Hw \leq g\}$ such that $x \in X$ if and only if there exists $w \in \mathbb{R}^q$ such that $(x, w) \in U$. (In other words, U is an EF of X if $(x \in X \iff (\exists\ w \in \mathbb{R}^q : (x, w) \in U))$) (where $G \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times p}$, $H \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times q}$, and $g \in \mathbb{R}^m$).

The purpose of this paper is to point out that the scope of applicability of EF work based on the above definitions is limited to cases in which U cannot be equivalently reformulated (with respect to the task of optimizing linear functions) in terms of the w variables only. For simplicity of exposition, without loss of generality, we will say that $G = \mathbf{0}$ in the above definitions if there exists a description of U which is in terms of the w-variables only and has the same or smaller complexity order of size. Or, equivalently, without loss of generality, we will say that $G \neq \mathbf{0}$ in the above definitions iff the x- and w-variables are required in every valid inequality description of U which has the same or smaller complexity order of size as the description at hand.

In particular, if every constraint of U which involves the x-variables is redundant in the description of U, then clearly, every one of those constraints as well as the x-variables themselves can be dropped (without loss, with respect to the task of optimizing linear functions) from the description of U, with the result that U would be stated in terms of the w-variables only. Also, in some cases (all of) the contraints involving the x-variables may become redundant only after other constraints in the description of U are re-written and/or new constraints are added (as exemplified by the case of the minimum spanning tree problem (MSTP) in section 4.2 of this paper). If either of these two cases is applicable, we will say that $G = \mathbf{0}$ in the above definitions. Otherwise, we will say that $G \neq \mathbf{0}$.

Remark 5 The following observations are in order with respect to Definitions 2, 3, and 4:

1. The statement of U in terms of inequality constraints only does not cause any loss of generality, since each equality constraint can be replaced by a pair of inequality constraints.

2. The system of linear equations which specify π in Definition 3 must be *valid* constraints for X and U. Hence, X and U can be respectively *extended* by adding those constraints to them, when trying to relate X and U using Definition 3. In that sense, Definition 3 "extends" Definitions 2 and 4.

3. All three definitions are equivalent when $G \neq \mathbf{0}$. However, this is not true when $G = \mathbf{0}$, as we will show in section 3 of this paper.

4. In the remainder of this paper, we will use the term "polytope" to refer to the polytope induced by a set of linear inequality constraints or the set of constraints itself, if this is convenient and does not cause ambiguity.

□

3 Non-applicability and degeneracy conditions for *extended formulations*

Our main result will now be developed.

Theorem 6 EF developments are not valid for relating the inequality descriptions of U and X in Definitions 2-4 when $G = \mathbf{0}$ in those definitions.

Proof. The proof will be in three parts. In Part 1, we will show that when $G = \mathbf{0}$, U cannot be an EF of X according to Definition 2. In Part 2, we will show that when $G = \mathbf{0}$, U cannot be an EF of X according to Definition 4. In Part 3, we will show that when $G = \mathbf{0}$, the EF notion under Definition 3 results in the condition that every given polytope is an *extended formulation* of every other given polytope, provided their sets of descriptive variables are disjoint, which means that the (EF) notion becomes degenerate/meaningless. In the discussion, we will only consider the case in which $U \neq \varnothing$ and $X \neq \varnothing$, since the theorem is trivial when $U = \varnothing$ or $X = \varnothing$.

(i) Consider Definition 2. Assume $G = \mathbf{0}$. Then, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_x(U) &= \{x \in \mathbb{R}^p : (\exists w \in \mathbb{R}^q : (x, w) \in U)\} \\ &= \{x \in \mathbb{R}^p : (\exists w \in \mathbb{R}^q : Hw \leq g\} \\ &= \mathbb{R}^p \\ &\neq X \quad \text{(since } X \text{ is a polytope and thus bounded, whereas } \mathbb{R}^p \text{ is unbounded).} \end{aligned}$$

Hence when $G = \mathbf{0}$, U cannot be an EF of X according to Definition 2.

(ii) Consider Definition 4. Assume $G = \mathbf{0}$. Then, we have:

$$(\exists w \in \mathbb{R}^q : \mathbf{0}x + Hw \leq g) \Longleftrightarrow (\exists w \in \mathbb{R}^q : Hw \leq g) \Longrightarrow (\forall x \in \mathbb{R}^p, (x, w) \in U)\,. \tag{1}$$

Which implies:

$$(\exists w \in \mathbb{R}^q : \mathbf{0}x + Hw \leq g) \nRightarrow x \in X \quad \text{(since } X \neq \mathbb{R}^p\text{)}. \tag{2}$$

From (2), the "if and only if" stipulation of Definition 4 cannot hold in general. Hence, when $G = \mathbf{0}$, U cannot be an EF of X according to Definition 4.

(*iii*) Now, consider Definition 3. We will show that the EF notion under this definition becomes degenerate/meaningless when $G = \mathbf{0}$. The reasons for this are that a polytope can also be stated in terms of its extreme points (see Rockafellar (1997, pp. 153-172), among others), and that a linear map (as stipulated in the definition) could be inferred from this statement without reference to an inequality description of the polytope. The proof consists of a counter-example to the sufficiency of the existence of a linear map, as stipulated in the definition, for implying EF relationships, as stipulated in the definition. Note that if $G = \mathbf{0}$ in Definition 3, then the linear inequality description of U involves the $w-$variables only.

For the sake of simplicity (but without loss of generality), let $\overline{U} \subset \mathbb{R}^5$ be described in the w-variables only as

$$\overline{U} = \{w \in \mathbb{R}^5_{\not<} : w_1 + w_2 = 5; w_1 - w_2 = 1; w_3 + w_4 + w_5 = 0\}. \tag{3}$$

Then, the vertex-description of $\overline{U}$ is

$$\overline{U} = \{w \in \mathbb{R}^5_{\not<} : w \in Conv\left(\left\{(3,2,0,0,0)^T\right\}\right)\}.$$

Now, let $X \subset \mathbb{R}^3_{\not<}$ be specified by its vertex-description as

$$X = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^3_{\not<} : x \in Conv(\left\{(2,1,5)^T\right\})\}.$$

(In other words, X consists of the point in $\mathbb{R}^3$, $(2,1,5)^T$.)

Then, the following are true:

(*iii*.1)

$$((x \in X) \text{ and } (w \in \overline{U})) \Longrightarrow x = Aw,$$

$$\text{where, among other possibilities, } A = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 2.5 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\ 1 & -1 & 5 & 6 & 7 \\ -1 & 4 & 8 & 9 & 10 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{4}$$

Hence, under Definition 3, $\overline{U}$ is an EF of every one of the infinitely-many possible inequality descriptions of X (since $x = Aw$ in the above is a linear map between $\overline{U}$ and X).

(*iii*.2) Similarly,

$$((x \in X) \text{ and } (w \in \overline{U})) \Longrightarrow w = Bx,$$

$$\text{where, among other possibilities, } B = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 & 0 \\ 3 & 1 & -2 \\ 2 & -11 & 1 \\ -10 & 30 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{5}$$

Hence, under Definition 3, every one of the infinitely-many possible inequality descriptions of X is an EF of the inequality descriptions of $\overline{U}$ as stated in (3) (and, in fact, of everyone of the infinitely-many possible inequality descriptions of $\overline{U}$).

(*iii*.3) Clearly, the EF relations based on (4) and (5) above are degenerate/meaningless, since no meaningful inferences can be made from them in attempting to compare inequality descriptions of $\overline{U}$ and X.

■

A fundamental notion in *extended formulations* theory is that the addition of redundant variables and constraints to the inequality description of a polytope does not change the EF relationships for that polytope. We use this fact to generalize the degeneracy/loss of meaningfulness which arises out of Definition 3 when $G = \mathbf{0}$ to Definitions 2 and 4, as follows.

Theorem 7 Provided redundant constraints and variables can be arbitrarily added to the descriptions of polytopes for the purpose of establishing EF relationships under Definitions 2-4, the descriptions of any two given non-empty polytopes expressed in disjoint variable spaces can be respectively *augmented* into being *extended formulations* of each other.

In other words, let $x^1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1}$ ($n_1 \in \mathbb{N}_+$) and $x^2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2}$ ($n_2 \in \mathbb{N}_+$) be vectors of variables with no components in common. Then, provided redundant constraints and variables can be arbitrarily added to the descriptions of polytopes for the purpose of establishing EF relationships, the inequality-description of every non-empty polytope in x^1 can be *augmented* into an EF of the inequality-description of every other non-empty polytope in x^2, and vice versa.

Proof. The proof is essentially by construction.

Let P_1 and P_2 be polytopes specified as:

$$P_1 = \{x^1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1} : A_1 x^1 \leq a_1\} \neq \varnothing \quad (\text{where } A_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1 \times n_1}, \text{ and } a_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1});$$

$$P_2 = \{x^2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2} : A_2 x^2 \leq a_2\} \neq \varnothing \quad (\text{where } A_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{p_2 \times n_2}, \text{ and } a_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{p_2}).$$

Clearly, $\forall (x^1,\, x^2) \in P_1 \times P_2$, $\forall q \in \mathbb{N}_+$, $\forall B_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{q \times n_1}$, $\forall B_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{q \times n_2}$, there exists $u \in \mathbb{R}^q_{\not<}$ such that the constraints

$$B_1 x^1 + B_2 x^2 - u \leq 0 \tag{6}$$

are *valid* for P_1 and P_2, respectively (i.e., they are *redundant* for P_1 and P_2, respectively).

Now, consider :

$$W := \Big\{ (x^1, x^2, u) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_2} \times \mathbb{R}^q_{\not<} :$$

$$C_1 A_1 x^1 \leq C_1 a_1; \tag{7}$$

$$B_1 x^2 + B_2 x^1 - u \leq 0; \tag{8}$$

$$C_2 A_2 x^2 \leq C_2 a_2 \Big\} \tag{9}$$

(where: $C_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1 \times p_1}$ and $C_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{p_2 \times p_2}$ are diagonal matrices with positive diagonal entries).

Clearly, W *augments* P_1 and P_2 respectively. Hence:

$$W \text{ is equivalent to } P_1, \text{ and} \tag{10}$$

W is equivalent to P_2 . (11)

Also clearly, we have:

$\varphi_{x^1}(W) = P_1$ (since $P_2 \neq \varnothing$, and ((8) and (9) are redundant for P_1)), and (12)

$\varphi_{x^2}(W) = P_2$ (since $P_1 \neq \varnothing$, and ((7) and (8) are redundant for P_2)). (13)

It follows from the combination of (10) and (13) that P_1 is an *extended formulation* of P_2.

It follows from the combination of (11) and (12) that P_2 is an *extended formulation* of P_1. ■

Example 8

Let

$$P_1 = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2_{\not<} : 2x_1 + x_2 \leq 6\};$$

$$P_2 = \{w \in \mathbb{R}^3_{\not<} : 18w_1 - w_2 \leq 23;\ 59w_1 + w_3 \leq 84\}.$$

For arbitrary matrices B_1, B_2, C_1, and C_2 (of appropriate dimensions, respectively); say $B_1 = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 2 \\ 3 & -4 \end{bmatrix}$, $B_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 5 & -6 & 7 \\ -10 & 9 & -8 \end{bmatrix}$, $C_1 = [7]$, and $C_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.5 \end{bmatrix}$; P_1 and P_2 can be *augmented* into *extended formulations* of each other using $u \in \mathbb{R}^2_{\not<}$ and W:

$$W = \left\{ (x, w, u) \in \mathbb{R}^{2+3+2}_{\not<} : \quad [7] \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{bmatrix} \leq 42\ ; \right.$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} -1 & 2 \\ 3 & -4 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 5 & -6 & 7 \\ -10 & 9 & -8 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} w_1 \\ w_2 \\ w_3 \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} u_1 \\ u_2 \end{bmatrix} \leq \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix};$$

$$\left. \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.5 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 18 & -1 & 0 \\ 59 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} w_1 \\ w_2 \\ w_3 \end{bmatrix} \leq \begin{bmatrix} 46 \\ 42 \end{bmatrix} \right\}.$$

□

4 Illustrations using some existing models

4.1 Application to the Fiorini *et al.* (2011; 2012) developments

Fiorini *et al.* (2012) is a re-organized and extended version of Fiorini *et al.* (2011). The key extension is the addition of another alternate defnition of *extended formulations* (page 96 of Fiorini *et al.* (2012)) which is recalled in this paper as Definition 4. This new alternate definition is then used to re-arrange "section 5" of Fiorini *et al.* (2011) into "section 2" and "section 3" of Fiorini *et al.* (2012). Hence, the developments in "section 5" of Fiorini *et al.* (2011) which depended on "Theorem 4" of that paper, are "stand-alones" (as "section 3") in Fiorini *et al.* (2012), and "Theorem 4" in Fiorini *et al.* (2011) is relabeled as "Theorem 13" in Fiorini *et al.* (2012).

Claim 9 The developments in Fiorini *et al.* (2011) are not valid for relating the inequality descriptions of U and X in Definitions 2-4 when $G = \mathbf{0}$.

Proof. Using the terminology and notation of Fiorini *et al.* (2011), the main results of section 2 of Fiorini *et al.* (2011) are developed in terms of $Q := \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+k} \mid Ex + Fy = g,\ y \in C\}$ and $P := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid Ax \leq b\}$, with Q (in Fiorini *et al.* (2011)) corresponding to U in Definitions 2-4, and P (in Fiorini *et al.* (2011)) corresponding to X in Definitions 2-4. Hence, $G = \mathbf{0}$ in Definitions 2-4 corresponds to $E = \mathbf{0}$ in Fiorini *et al.* (2011). Hence, firstly, assume $E = \mathbf{0}$ in the expression of Q (i.e., $Q := \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+k} \mid \mathbf{0}x + Fy = g,\ y \in C\}$). Then, secondly, consider Theorem 4 of Fiorini *et al.* (2011) (which is pivotal in that work). We have the following:

(*i*) If $A \neq \mathbf{0}$ in the expression of P, then the proof of the theorem is invalid since that proof requires setting "$E := A$" (see Fiorini *et al.* (2011, p. 7));

(*ii*) If $A = \mathbf{0}$, then $P := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \mathbf{0}x \leq b\}$. This implies that either $P = \mathbb{R}^d$ (if $b \geq \mathbf{0}$) or $P = \varnothing$ (if $b \ngeq \mathbf{0}$). Hence, P would be either unbounded or empty. Hence, there could not exist a non-empty polytope, $Conv(V)$, such that $P = Conv(V)$ (see Fiorini *et al.* (2011, 16-17), among others). Hence, the conditions in the statement of Theorem 4 of Fiorini *et al.* (2011) would be *ill-defined*/impossible.

Hence, the developments in Fiorini *et al.* (2011) are not valid for relating U and X in Definitions 2-4 when $G = \mathbf{0}$ in those definitions. ■

Claim 10 The developments in Fiorini *et al.* (2012) are not valid for relating the inequality descriptions of U and X in Definitions 2-4 when $G = \mathbf{0}$.

Proof. First, note that "Theorem 13" of Fiorini *et al.* (2012, p. 101) is the same as "Theorem 4" of Fiorini *et al.* (2011). Hence, the proof of Claim 9 above is applicable to "Theorem 13" of Fiorini *et al.* (2012). Hence, the parts of the developments in Fiorini *et al.* (2012) that hinge on this result (namely, from "section 4" onward in Fiorini et al. (2012)) are not valid for relating U and X in Definitions 2-4 when $G = \mathbf{0}$.

Now consider "Theorem 3" of Fiorini *et al.* (2012) (section 3, page 99). The proof of that theorem hinges on the statement that (using the terminology and notation of Fiorini *et al.* (2012) which is similar to that in Fiorini et al. (2011)):

$$Ax \leq b \Longleftrightarrow \exists y : E^{\leq}x + F^{\leq}y \leq g^{\leq},\ E^{=}x + F^{=}y \leq g^{=}. \tag{14}$$

Note that $G = \mathbf{0}$ in Definitions 2-4 would correspond to $E^{\leq} = E^{=} = \mathbf{0}$ in (14). Hence, assume $E^{\leq} = E^{=} = \mathbf{0}$ in (14). Then, clearly, the "if and only if" stipulation of (14) cannot be satisfied in general, since

$$(\exists y : \mathbf{0} \cdot x + F^{\leq}y \leq g^{\leq},\ \mathbf{0} \cdot x + F^{=}y \leq g^{=}) \text{ cannot imply } (Ax \leq b) \text{ in general.}$$

Hence, Theorem 3 of Fiorini *et al.* (2012) is not valid for relating U and X in Definitions 2-4, when $G = \mathbf{0}$.

Hence, the developments in Fiorini *et al.* (2012) are not valid for relating U and X in Definitions 2-4 when $G = \mathbf{0}$ in those definitions. ■

4.2 The case of the Minimum Spanning Tree Problem: Redundancy matters when "$G = \mathbf{0}$"

The consideration of "$G = \mathbf{0}$" we have introduced in this paper is an important one because, as we have shown, it refines the notion of EFs by separating the case in which the notion is meaningful from the case in which the notion is degenerate and ambiguous. The degeneracy (when "$G = \mathbf{0}$") stems from the fact that every polytope is potentially an EF of every other polytope, as we have shown in section 3 of this paper. The ambiguity stems from the fact that one would reach contradicting conclusions as to what is/is not an EF of a given polytope, depending on what we do with the redundant constraints and variables which are introduced. This is illustrated in the following example.

Example 11 Refer back to the numerical example in Part (*iii*) of the proof of Theorem 6. An example of an inequality description of X in that numerical example is: $\overline{X} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^3_{\not<} : x_1 - x_2 + x_3 = 6;\ x_1 + x_2 \geq 3;\ x_1 + x_3 \leq 7;\ x_2 + x_3 \geq 6;\ \ x_1 \leq 2\}$. (It easy to verify that the feasible set of $\overline{X}$ is indeed $\{(2, 1, 5)^T\}$.) Let U' denote $\overline{U}$ augmented with the constraints of the linear map, $x - Aw = 0$. Clearly U' **does** project to X under the standard definition (Definition 2), whereas $\overline{U}$ does not. Hence, the answer to the question of whether or not $\overline{U}$ is an *extended formulation* of X under the standard definition depends on what we do with the redundant constraints, $x - Aw = 0$. If these constraints are added to $\overline{U}$, then $\overline{U}$ becomes U', and the answer is "Yes." If these constraints are left out, the answer is "No." Hence, the *extended formulations* relation which is established between $\overline{U}$ and X under Definition 3 is ambiguous (in addition to being degenerate, as we have shown in Theorem 6). $\square$

A well-researched case in point for the discussions above is that of the Minimum Spanning Tree Problem (MSTP). Without the refinement brought by the distinction we make between the cases of $G = \mathbf{0}$ and $G \neq \mathbf{0}$ in Definitions 2-4, the case of the MSTP would mean that it is possible to *extend* an exponential-sized model into a polynomial-sized one by (simply) adding redundant variables and constraints to it (i.e., *augmenting* it), which is a clearly-unreasonable/out-of-the-question proposition. To see this, assume (as is normally done in EF work) that the addition of redundant constraints and variables does not matter as far EF relationships are concerned. Since the constraints of Edmonds' model (Edmonds (1970)) are redundant for the model of Martin (1991), one could *augment* Martin's formulation with these constraints. The resulting model would still be considered a polynomial-sized one. But note that this particular *augmentation* of Martin's model would also be an *augmentation* of Edmonds' model. Hence, the conclusion would be that Edmonds' exponential-sized model has been *augmented* into a polynomial-sized one, which is an impossibility, since one cannot reduce the number of facets of a given polytope by simply adding redundant constraints to the inequality description of that polytope. The distinction we are bringing to attention in this paper explains the paradox, as further detailed below.

Example 12 We show that Martin's polynomial-sized LP model of the MSTP is not an EF (in a non-degenerate, meaningful sense) of Edmonds's exponential LP model of the MSTP, by showing that there exists a reformulation of Martin's model which does not require the variables of Edmonds' model (which is essentially the equivalent of having $G = \mathbf{0}$ in the description of U in Definitions 2-4).

- **Using the notation in Martin(1991), i.e.:**

- $N := \{1, \ldots, n\}$ (Set of vertices);
- E : Set of edges;
- $\forall S \subseteq N$, $\gamma(S)$: Set of edges with both ends in S.

- **Exponential-sized/"sub-tour elimination" LP formulation (Edmonds (1970)):**

  (P):

  Minimize: $\sum_{e \in E} c_e x_e$

  Subject To: $\sum_{e \in E} x_e = n - 1;$

  $\sum_{e \in \gamma(S)} x_e \leq |S| - 1; \quad S \subset E \ ;$

  $x_e \geq 0$ for all $e \in E$.

- **Polynomial-sized LP reformulation (Martin (1991)):**

  (Q):

  Minimize: $\sum_{e \in E} c_e x_e$

  Subject To: $\sum_{e \in E} x_e = n - 1;$

  $z_{k,i,j} + z_{k,j,i} = x_e; \quad k = 1, \ldots, n; \ \ e \in \gamma(\{i, j\});$

  $\sum_{s > i} z_{k,i,s} + \sum_{h < i} z_{k,i,h} \leq 1; \quad k = 1, \ldots, n; \quad i \neq k;$

  $\sum_{s > k} z_{k,k,s} + \sum_{h < k} z_{k,k,h} \leq 0; \ \ k = 1, \ldots, n;$

  $x_e \geq 0$ for all $e \in E$; $\quad z_{k,i,j} \geq 0$ for all k, i, j.

- **Re-statement of Martin's LP model:**

  For each $e \in E$:

  - Denote the ends of e as i_e and j_e,respectively;
  - Fix an arbitrary node, r_e, which is not incident on e (i.e., r_e is such that it is not an end of e).

- Then, one can verify that Q is equivalent to:

  (Q'):

$$
\begin{array}{|ll}
\text{Minimize:} & \sum_{e\in E} c_e z_{r_e,i_e,j_e} + \sum_{e\in E} c_e z_{r_e,j_e,i_e} \\
\text{Subject To:} & \sum_{e\in E} z_{r_e,i_e,j_e} + \sum_{e\in E} z_{r_e,j_e,i_e} = n-1; \\
& z_{k,i_e,j_e} + z_{k,j_e,i_e} = z_{r_e,i_e,j_e} + z_{r_e,j_e,i_e}; \quad k=1,\ldots,n; \quad e\in E; \\
& \sum_{s>i} z_{k,i,s} + \sum_{h<i} z_{k,i,h} \leq 1; \quad i,\, k=1,\ldots,n : i\neq k; \\
& \sum_{s>k} z_{k,k,s} + \sum_{h<k} z_{k,k,h} \leq 0; \quad k=1,\ldots,n; \\
& z_{k,i,j} \geq 0 \ \text{ for all } k,\, i,\, j.
\end{array}
$$

□

Claim 13 We claim that the reason EF work relating formulation sizes does not apply to the case of the MSTP is that although Martin's model can be made to project to Edmond's model, that projection is degenerate/non-meaningful in the sense we have described in this paper.

5 Alternate/Auxiliary Models

In this section, we provide some insights into the meaning of the existence of an affine map establishing a one-to-one correspondence between polytopes when the sets of descriptive variables are disjoint, as brought to our attention in private e-mail communications by Kaibel (2013), and Yannakakis (2013), respectively. The linear map stipulated in Definition 3 is a special case of the affine map. Referring back to Definitions 2-4, we will show in this section that when $G = \mathbf{0}$ in the expression of U and there exists a one-to-one affine mapping of X onto U, then U is simply an alternate model (a "reformulation") of X which can be used, in an "auxiliary" way, in order to optimize any linear function of x over X, without any reference to/knowledge of an inequality description of X.

Example 14

- Let:
  - $x \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and $w \in \mathbb{R}^q$ be disjoint vectors of variables;
  - $X := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^p : Ax \leq a\}$ (where $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times p}$, and $a \in \mathbb{R}^m$);
  - $U := \{w \in \mathbb{R}^q : Dw \leq d\}$ (where $D \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times q}$, and $d \in \mathbb{R}^n$);
  - $L := \{(x,w) \in \mathbb{R}^{p+q} : x - Cw = b\}$ (where $C \in \mathbb{R}^{p\times q}$, and $b \in \mathbb{R}^p$).
- Assume that the non-negativity requirements for x and w are included in the constraints of X and U, respectively, and that L is redundant for X and for U.
- Then, it is easy to see that the optimization problem, *Problem* LP_1:

| Minimize: $\alpha^T x$

| Subject To: $(x, w) \in L;\ \ w \in U$

| (where $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^p$).

is equivalent to the smaller linear program, *Problem* LP_2:

| Minimize: $\left(\alpha^T C\right) w + \alpha^T b$

| Subject To: $w \in U$

| (where $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^p$).

- Hence, if L is the graph of a one-to-one correspondence between the points of X and the points of U (see Beachy and Blair (2006, pp. 47-59)), then, the optimization of any linear function of x over X can be done by first using *Problem* LP_2 in order to get an optimal w, and then using Graph L to "retrieve" the corresponding x. Note that the second term of the objective function of *Problem* LP_2 can be ignored in the optimization process of *Problem* LP_2, since that term is a constant.

  Hence, if L is derived from knowledge of the vertex description of X only, then this would mean that the inequality description of X is not involved in the "two-step" solution process (of using *Problem* LP_2 and then Graph L), but rather, that only the vertex description of X is involved. $\square$

Hence, when $G = 0$, the existence of the linear map, π, stipulated in Definition 3 does not imply that U is an EF of X, but rather that U can be used to solve the optimization problem over X without any reference to/knowledge of an inequality description of X, if π is not derived from an inequality description of X.

6 Conclusions

We have shown that *extended formulations* theory aimed at comparing and/or bounding sizes of inequality descriptions of polytopes are not applicable when the set of the descriptive variables for those polytopes are disjoint (i.e., when "$G = \mathbf{0}$"). We have illiustrated our ideas using the Fiorini et al. (2011; 2012) developments, and Martin's (1991) LP formulation of the MSTP, respectively. We have also shown that the "$G = \mathbf{0}$" consideration we have brought to attention explains the existing paradox in EF theory (typified by the case of the MSTP), which is that by simply adding redundant constraints and variables to a model of exponential size one can obtain a model of polynomial size. We believe these constitute important, useful steps towards a more complete definition of the scope of applicability for EF's.

References

[1] Bazaraa, M., H.D. Sherali, and C.M. Shetty (2006). *Nonlinear Programming - Theory and Algorithms*. Wiley, New York, NY.

[2] Beachy, J.A. and W.D. Blair (2006). *Abstract Algebra*. Waveland Press, Inc., Long Grove, IL.

[3] Conforti, M., G. Cornuéjols, and G. Zambelli (2010). Extended formulations in combinatorial optimization. *4OR* 8:1, pp. 1-48.

[4] Conforti, M., G. Cornuéjols, and G. Zambelli (2013). Extended formulations in combinatorial optimization. *Annals of Operations Research* 204:1, pp. 97-143.

[5] Edmonds, J. (1970). "Submodular functions, matroids and certain polyhedra" in: R.K Guy *et al.* (eds.), *Combinatorial Structures and Their Applications*, Gordon and Breach, New York, pp. 69-87.

[6] Fiorini, S., S. Massar, S. Pokutta, H.R. Tiwary, and R. de Wolf (2011). Linear vs. Semidefinite Extended Formulations: Exponential Separation and Strong Bounds. *Unpublished* (Available at: http://arxiv.org/pdf/1111.0837.pdf).

[7] Fiorini, S., S. Massar, S. Pokutta, H.R. Tiwary, and R. de Wolf (2012). Linear vs. Semidefinite Extended Formulations: Exponential Separation and Strong Bounds. *Proceedings of the 44th ACM Symposium on the Theory of Computing* (*STOC '12*), New York, NY, pp. 95-106.

[8] Jünger, M., T. Liebling, D. Naddef, G. Nemhauser, W. Pulleyblank, G. Reinelt, G. Rinaldi, and L. Wolsey, eds (2010). *50 Years of Integer Programming 1958-2008*. Springer, New York, NY.

[9] Kaibel, V. (2011). Extended formulations in combinatorial optimization. *Optima* 85:2, pp.2-7.

[10] Kaibel (2013). *Private Email Communications On:* "LP-Formulations that Induce Extensions" by V. Kaibel, M. Walter, and S. Weltge (2013).

[11] Kaibel, V. and M. Walter (2013). Simple Extensions of Polytopes. *Unpublished* (Available at: http://arxiv.org/pdf/1311.3470v1.pdf).

[12] Kaibel, V. and S. Weltge (2013). Lower bounds on the Sizes of Integer Programs Without Additional Variables. *Unpublished* (Available at: http://arxiv.org/pdf/1311.3255v1.pdf).

[13] Martin, R. K. (1991). Using separation algorithms to generate mixed integer model reformulations. *Operations Research Letters* 10:3, pp. 119-128.

[14] Rockaffelar, R. T. (1997). *Convex Analysis*. Princeton University Press.

[15] Yannakakis, M. (1991). Expressing combinatorial optimization problems by linear programming. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences* 43:3, pp. 441-466.

[16] Yannakakis, M. (2013). *Private Email Communications.*